



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,253	08/06/2001	Eun Seog Lee	MR2685-91	7861

7590

11/02/2005

Rosenberg Klein & Lee  
Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043

EXAMINER

HAILU, TADESSE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/890,253

Applicant(s)

LEE, EUN SEOG

Examiner

Tadesse Hailu

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The previously indicated allowability of claims 1-22 are withdrawn. This Office Action reopens prosecution of the above claims of the patent application (09/890,253).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In line 20, the claim recites "input from the outside"; this claim is not clearly reciting what the term "outside" is referring to. It is not clear whether the input is from the processor (which is outside form the first monitor), an external (network) device, or from input devices. Since the claim does not clearly recite the term, "the outside" is referring to, the claim is indefinite, Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1, 4, and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bril et al (US Pat No. 6,118,413).

With regard to claim 1:

Bril discloses a data processing system (see Fig. 2 or 6) using dual monitors (e.g., CRT 695 and LCD (active 680 or passive panel 670), the system comprising:

a memory (620) for providing a data processing area using a program;

at least one or more input means (e.g., pointing device, such as a mouse) for inputting data (column 11, lines 15-33);

a first video graphics adapter (VGA) for generating and outputting screen data for displaying a result processed by at least one or more programs (column 9, lines 55-61);

a second video graphics adapter for generating and outputting screen data for displaying a result processed by at least one or more programs (column 9, lines 61-65); the result being different from the result processed and displayed by the first VGA (column 10, lines 64-column 11, lines 6);

a processor (211, Fig. 2) for processing data input through the input means using the memory and outputting the processed result through the first and second VGAs (column 7, lines 26-39, column 11, lines 15-33);

a first monitor (e.g., CRT 695, Fig. 6) for displaying screen data output from the first graphics adapter (column 13, lines 4-13);

and a second monitor (e.g., LCD 680) for displaying screen data output from the second graphics adapter (column 13, lines 4-13),

Bril further discloses that the processor (211) displays the processed result (column 10, lines 64-column 11, lines 6) of a main program presently used by a user through the first VGA (Fig. 2, column 9, lines 55-61) and the first monitor, processes information (column 10, lines 64-column 11, lines 6), which is different from the contents displayed on the first monitor (CRT 695) and input from the outside (e.g., from external), and displays the information through the second VGA (column 9, lines 61-65) and the second monitor, and in case of selecting one of user interfaces displayed through the first or second monitors, displays the processed result on the other monitor (column 10, lines 64-column 11, lines 6).

With regard to claim 4:

Bril describes connecting the local CPU with an external host (e.g., network) via graphics adapter (column 7, lines 27-39),

With regard to claim 6:

Bril illustrates that the processor further includes a broadcasting receiving part (via the TV (292) antenna) for receiving TV broadcasting wave and outputting video and audio signals (Fig. 2, column 8, lines 16-24).

With regard to claim 7:

Bril illustrates that the video data received by the broadcasting receiving part is output through one of the first and second VGAs (column 7, lines 48-65, column 8, lines 16-61, Fig. 2).

With regard to claim 8:

Bril illustrates that a broadcasting receiving part mounted (see antenna) integrally with one of the first and second monitors to receive TV broadcasting, the broadcasting receiving part transmitting received broadcasting signal to the processor and outputting video signal through one of the first and second VGAs (column 7, lines 48-65, column 8, lines 16-61, Fig. 2)

With regard to claim 9:

Bril illustrates that a broadcasting receiving part mounted integrally with one of the first and second monitors to receive TV broadcasting, the broadcasting receiving part being controlled by the processor, converting video signal of the received broadcasting signals into video signal and outputting video signal through one of the first and second monitors (column 7, lines 19-65, Fig. 2).

With regard to claim 10:

Bril illustrates that the first and second VGAS and the first and second monitors are connected with one video cable respectively (see Fig. 1, 2, or 6).

With regard to claim 11:

Bril illustrates that the first and second VGAS and the first and second monitors are connected with one video cable, which integrates a plurality of lines for transmitting two video signals into one package (see Fig. 1, 2, or 6).

With regard to claim 12:

Bril illustrates that the first and second VGAS are constructed with a dual VGA having two output ports (see Fig. 2 or 6).

4. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Clark et al (US Pat No. 5,835,090).

With regard to claim 14:

Clark discloses a dual monitor (see Fig. 1, monitors 12 and 14) for use in a computer system having a VGA outputting two video signals comprising'.

Clark also discloses a first monitor (Fig. 1) for receiving and displaying a first information data comprising main processing contents of a program (e.g., Fig. 5, see also the content displayed in monitor 98), which is presently being used by a user, output from a processor of the computer system (column 19, lines 59-67).

Clark also discloses a second monitor (Fig. 1) formed integrally with the first monitor (Fig. 1, Fig. 5)), for receiving and displaying any one of the first information data being displayed on the first monitor (e.g., each one of the document (content) shown in the first monitor is now shown separately in different monitors, example, CD document file in monitor 102).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bril et al (US Pat No. 6,118,413) and Kantor et al (6,025,871).

With regard to claims 2:

While Bril illustrates peripheral interfaces to interact with CPU (Fig. 2), but “a sound processing part having a microphone for inputting sound signal and a speaker for outputting sound, which are integrated to the first and second monitors.” Kantor, on the other hand discloses a user interface for a video conferencing system comprising the above limitations (Fig. 1, column 1, lines 65-column 2, lines 31). It would have been an obvious choice to incorporate a sound processing part having microphone of Kantor’s with the multimedia methodology (column 1, lines 21-23) of Bril because the sound system will enhance the methodology of Bril, that is, one can record his own voice or any other sound.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bril et al (US Pat No. 6,118,413).

With regard to claim 3:

Bril illustrates multiple monitors (e.g., flat panel and CRT), but Bril neither mentioned the size of each screen monitors nor integration of monitors. Bril does not mention that the second monitor has a screen size smaller than that of the first monitor and the second monitor is constructed integrally with the first monitor. However, Official notice is taken that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make one of the monitor (second monitor) to have a screen size bigger than that of the other screen monitor (first monitor), since such a modification would have involved a mere



change or replacement of a component (monitor). A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to replace one of Clark's monitors with smaller screen size monitor because at least smaller monitors takes less desk space. And having another integrated larger monitor will be used for main content as shown in Clark (monitor 98, Fig. 5). Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to integrally or closely mount or assemble the second monitor of Bril with the first monitor of Bril, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a user in the art to make plural parts unitary as a matter of obvious engineering choice. *In re Larson*, 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965); *In re Lockart*, 90 USPQ 214 (CCP1 1951).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bril et al (US Pat No. 6,118,413), Kantor et al (6,025,871) and Wheeler et al (US Pat No. 6,624,797).

With regard to claim 5:

While Bril illustrates peripheral interfaces to interact with CPU (Fig. 2), but Bril does not mention a digital camera and USB port. Kantor, however, discloses a digital camera (108) that can be used with the monitors (113 and 114). It would have been obvious to incorporate Kantor's camera with the multimedia application (Bril, column 1, lines 21-23) of Bril because incorporating the camera will enhance the multimedia application of Bril. Furthermore, neither Bril nor Kantor discloses USB port as claimed in claim 5, Wheeler, however, discloses USB port (Fig.1). Thus, it would have been

obvious to include the Wheeler's USB port as one of the peripheral interfaces in Bril's (Bril, Fig. 2), because using the USB port is faster in transferring data to/from a device.

8. Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bril et al (US Pat No. 6,118,413) Shin (US Pat No. 6,804,724).

With regard to claim 13:

While Bril illustrates several connectors (Fig. 2), such as connecting VGA card to TV/CRT and LCD, but Bril does not show D-sub connector serving as a video output port, and serving as video input board as claimed in Claim 13. Shin, on the other hand discloses such standard connector having a plurality of pins for processing and transmitting video signals (see he connectors 521 and 522 uses 15-pin D-sub female VGA connectors, Fig. 5, column 5, lines 46-61). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Shin's D-connectors in place of Bril's connectors because the D-sub connectors as described in Shin are the standard and widely used connectors, therefore they will be available and compatible with a plurality of devices to work with.

9. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al (US Pat No. 5,835,090).

With regard to claim 15:

Clark illustrates multiple monitors (Figs. 2 and 5), but Clark does not mentioned the size of each screen monitors. Clark does not mention that the second monitor has a screen size smaller than that of the first monitor. However, Official notice is taken that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make one of the monitor

(second monitor) to have a screen size bigger than that of the other screen monitor (first monitor), since such a modification would have involved a mere change or replacement of a component (monitor). A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to replace one of Clark's monitors with smaller screen size monitor because at least smaller monitors takes less desk space. And having another integrated larger monitor will be used for main content as shown in Clark (monitor 98, Fig. 5).

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kantor et al (6,025,871) and Salesky et al (6,343,313).

With regard to claim 16:

Kantor is directed to a user interface for a video conferencing system. Kantor further describes a method for controlling external data, remote video (network) using a data processing system having a dual monitor (Fig. 1, Monitors 1 and 2).

Kantor describes and illustrates displaying results processed by a program used by a user on the first monitor (e.g. monitor 340, for viewing local video image) and an information provided by a server on the second monitor, when the user connects to the remote video network using the computer (e.g., monitor 342, for viewing remote video image) (see Figs. 13-33).

But Kantor does not explicitly describes "constructing a network using a plurality of computers and a server, the computer using a dual monitor having first and second monitors as a display means, the server connecting the plurality of computers with the

Art Unit: 2173

network to control them and connecting to an Internet; Salesky is directed to computer conferencing system. Salesky further discloses constructing a network (Fig. 1) using a plurality of computers (Fig. 1) and a server, the computer using a dual monitor having first and second monitors as a display means, the server connecting the plurality of computers with the network to control them and connecting to an Internet (Figs. 9A-9G, column 26, lines 37-column 26, lines 14).

Salesky and Kantor are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, conferencing system.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the construction step describes in Salesky with the method described in Kantor's remote video construction. The suggestion /motivation for doing so would have been to provide additional information from several devices within the network participants.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Salesky with Kantor to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

With regard to claim 17:

Salesky and Kantor disclose the information displayed on the second monitor is a message or ad contents provided and displayed by the server (Kantor, e.g., monitor 342, for viewing remote video image) (see Figs. 13-33).

With regard to claim 20:

Salesky and Kantor disclose that the plurality of the computers connected to the network are used as a message communication system, the received message is

displayed on the second monitor (Kantor, e.g., monitor 342, for viewing remote video image) (see Figs. 13-33).

With regard to claim 21:

Salesky and Kantor disclose that at least two or more users work jointly with the same program using the plurality of computers connected to the network, the contents of the other party's work is displayed on the second monitor to work while confirming the contents of the other party's work at the same time (Salesky, Figs. 9A-9G, column 26, lines 37-column 26, lines 14).

With regard to claim 22:

Salesky and Kantor disclose that the plurality of the computers connected to the network are used as a video communication system, a digital camera is mounted on each computer, the user's picture is transmitted to the other party's computer, and at the same time, the user's picture is displayed on one of the first and second monitors, and the other party's picture is displayed on the other monitor (Salesky, Figs. 9A-9G, column 26, lines 37-column 26, lines 14).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

11. Claims 18, and 19 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With regard to claim 18:

The prior art of records do not clearly describe that the server secures a control right to the second monitor of the user's computer and controls the use of the second monitor by the user's manipulation.

With regard to claim 19:

The prior art of records do not clearly describe the plurality of the computers connected to the network are used as a settlement system, the first or second monitors connected to a reporter's computer and a deciding report's computer respectively display settlement contents transmitted from the other parties' computers respectively and the other monitors display different data except for the settlement contents respectively.

CONCLUSION

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tadesse Hailu, whose telephone number is (571) 272-4051. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:30 – 7:00 ET. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at (571) 272-4048 Art Unit 2173.

13 An inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Examiner Tadesse Hailu  
Art Unit 2173  
10/29/05

